

# Southeast Asian Regional Organization in Archaeology

*Received 9 May 1974*

WILHELM G. SOLHEIM II

THE peoples of Southeast Asia might have led the world in the development of agriculture by their possible Late Pleistocene domestication of plants. This may not be established for years to come, if at all, but the thought is here that the prehistory of Southeast Asia was not dominated by a series of migrations from outside the area, which brought in all cultural advancement, but rather was a story of regional achievement. This achievement was not only responsible for most of the cultural development of the area but could have been the source of much of this development for eastern and southern Asia. These ideas have been reaching the peoples of Southeast Asia and they find them exhilarating. Moreover, the few archaeologists of Southeast Asia find these ideas a challenge, and this challenge appears to be leading (or pushing) them into a "first" for Southeast Asia, a regional organization of archaeology.

But you will say, "There are many regional archaeological organizations, and many of these cover very large areas." These organizations are, almost all of them, for purposes of communication, to hold international meetings and through these to share information. They are made up of individuals, with individual problems and individual interests. True, they may accomplish something of regional importance, such as the standardization of nomenclature for African prehistory, but it was the needs of individuals that brought this about. What appears to be developing in Southeast Asia is a cooperative program which will go far beyond communication and may include integrated research and advanced training, as well as incorporating a data bank and clearing house.

At the moment all of this development is not occurring within one framework but rather within several, and the different organizations involved have no relationship with each other. For the most part, however, the same people are involved in the different organizations, and there is no competition among them for scarce resources. All of these are very new programs or organizations, the oldest officially starting in October 1972 following an organizational meeting in January 1972.

These include: the UNESCO-sponsored Malay Studies Program; the meeting of the First Regional Seminar on Southeast Asian Prehistory and Archaeology, held in Manila in June-July 1972; the First ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) Summer Field School in Archaeology, held in Batangas, Philippines in May 1973; field programs in West Malaysia and Thailand, including regional training of archaeology students; and ARCAFA (Applied Research Center in Archaeology and Fine Arts).

#### THE MALAY CULTURE PROJECT

A detailed account of the origin and content of the Malay Culture Project is not appropriate in this paper, though it is of interest. In itself it is one suggestion that the regional organization of archaeology, which is the subject of this paper, is not the only subject area undergoing incipient regionalization in Southeast Asia. One or two statements on the project are needed, however, to provide context.

The resolution which started the Study of Malay Culture project at the 16th session of the General Conference of UNESCO in 1970 was sponsored by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. A preliminary organizational meeting for the project was held at Puntjak, Indonesia in April 1972. Acting on the instruction of the Puntjak conference, the "International Meeting of Experts for the Launching of the Malay Culture Project," held in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, in January 1972, produced specific recommendations on which the program was organized.

Prehistory, while mentioned in the instructions of the Puntjak conference, did not have a strong position in the project. At the Kuala Lumpur meeting we argued that the primary unity of the Malay cultures came about during prehistoric times and that the advent of the different world religions in the area, followed by colonialization, significantly reduced this unity. This premise was accepted by the members of the meeting, and prehistory was accepted as an equal partner among the different approaches to be used in the project. Prehistory, and some linguistics, was subsumed under the segment of the program titled "The Foundations of Malay Culture."

Rather than trying to summarize the prehistorical projects proposed by the Kuala Lumpur meeting, I quote *in extenso* the relevant portions from the Final Report of this meeting (UNESCO 1972: Appendix V).

#### THE FOUNDATIONS OF MALAY CULTURE SPECIFIC PROJECTS

##### *Project 2: The Hunting and Collecting Contribution*

###### *Objective*

To enable the contribution of the aboriginal peoples (*orang asli*), found scattered in all of the five sponsoring countries, to Malay culture to be recognized and located for research purposes.

*Implementation*

(i) An ethno-archaeological study of a small group of a pure hunting-collecting group of negritos in northeastern Luzon (Philippines) so that archaeologists will recognize a hunting-gathering site, interpret its contents logically, and discover where to look for this kind of site.

*Priorities*

(i) This study requires an emergency priority, as this one known group (not yet in close contact with outsiders) will only be able to maintain its traditional form of life for a few more years until the expanding Philippine population requires their land.

(ii) Negritos are completely unknown archaeologically and if it is not discovered how to recognize their sites while there is still a traditional group to work with it may well be that they will never be found. . . .

*Project 3: The Origins of Domestication and Cultivation**Objective*

To investigate the origins and early development and diffusion of horticulture and agriculture in South-East Asia (i.e., the beginnings of Malay culture).

*Implementation*

(i) Continuing exploration and excavation in the area of Spirit Cave (North-Western Thailand), where first domestication of plants and possibly animals was found, to further clarify the contents and evolution of these cultures found there. There are indications that very early rice agriculture (circa 7,000 B.C.) may be found in this area. This is a long-term project.

(ii) Exploration and excavation of known Hoabinhian level sites south of Pagan in Burma, and Indonesia, to provide comparative data for an area other than Spirit Cave on the late Hoabinhian origins in South-East Asia of cultivated plants and domesticated animals (one year field programme).

(iii) The physical anthropological study of human skeletal remains from Hoabinhian sites to distinguish the possible physical origins of a portion of the genetic matrices of the Malay peoples.

(iv) Composition of the cultural contents of published and unpublished Hoabinhian and Hoabinhian level sites for further definition of Hoabinhian and Hoabinhian level cultures.

(v) Initiation of a Phu Wiang Project to investigate the ecological adaptation of the earliest known rice growing culture in the world (North-Eastern Thailand, previous to 3,000 B.C.; long-term project).

*Priorities*

(i) All field projects above (items 1, 2, and 5) have to do with a much earlier and much higher development in the beginnings of Malay culture than previously imagined and are therefore of great current interest not only to people of the

Malay region but to all peoples of the world. These must go forward as quickly as possible. These projects are ongoing but inclusion as high priority projects under this programme will help with their further financing and acceptance in the cooperating host country.

(ii) Competent and systematic study of the human skeletal remains from Hoabinhian sites has been extremely lacking. It is necessary for study of this material as soon as research staff can be freed from present work to establish the genetic relationships of the Hoabinhian peoples with the later Malay and other South-East Asian peoples. Unesco aid would allow this to get under way in the second two year period (1974-1975).

(iii) Comparative study of Hoabinhian sites is likely to develop in an academic context without Unesco funding when its relevance, by inclusion herein as an important project, is established.

#### *Project 4: Mainland Proto-Malay Cultures*

##### *Objective*

To investigate the origins and development of the so-called Lungshanoid cultures, one or several of which are probably ancestral to the cultures which evolved into two of the primary cultural traditions which together constitute the foundation of Malay culture (the cultures associated with the Sa-huỳnh-Kalanay and the "Bau-Malay" Pottery Traditions).

##### *Implementation*

Classification of known Lungshanoid sites on the basis of their pottery to distinguish the sources of the two "Foundation of Malay Culture" pottery traditions (one of these is the already known Geometric pottery, fore-runner of the "Bau-Malay" Pottery), with the following excavation of two or three sites in both of the two classifications to establish internal evolution and dating (with international cooperation).

##### *Priority*

This would establish the yet unknown early relationships of two important streams which jointly constituted the foundation of Malay culture and the dating for movement out of the mainland into island South-East Asia and the specific beginning of Malay culture. This should be started as soon as arrangements can be worked out with Unesco assistance.

#### *Project 5: Bibliography of South-East Asian Prehistory*

##### *Objective*

To compile a bibliography of South-East Asian prehistory to facilitate comparative research on the origins of Malay culture.

##### *Implementation*

Annotation and key word indexing of a bibliography, much of which is already assembled, to be fed into computer tape for an open ended computerised

bibliography which can constantly be added to and run off at any time for a total, up to date bibliography, or through the key word index, articles and books with data on any indexed subject can be extracted for specific use.

### *Priorities*

To be done 1973-74, to be available for all later comparative research, hopefully with Unesco aid.

### *Project 6: The Spread and Integration of Malay Culture from Its Origins*

#### *Objective*

To investigate key areas and cultures in the spread and mingling of the major traditions in Malay culture and in the relationships between the cultures of the five sponsoring countries.

#### *Implementation*

- (i) Exploration and preliminary archaeological testing to investigate a key area in the spread and relationships (at all time levels) in the evolution of Malay culture between Indonesia and the Philippines and between the Malay culture area and Oceania will commence in two year phases (long-term). The testing area will include South-Eastern Mindanao (Philippines), North-Eastern Indonesia (Minahassa, Moluccas, Halmahera and West Irian including off-shore islands).
- (ii) Exploration and preliminary archaeological testing shall be undertaken to investigate a key coastal area in the origin and spread of early Malay culture between the Philippines, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand, and on to Madagascar. The testing area will include coastal South-Western Philippines (Palawan and Sulu Archipelago), East Malaysia (Sabah, Sarawak and Brunei), Northern Indonesia (Java and Sumatra), West Malaysia, and peninsular Thailand.
- (iii) The physical anthropological study of the human skeletal [material] recorded from the two programmes above, other human skeletal material of this general period, and the study of present-day Malay peoples, to accumulate data for a comprehensive analysis of the physical interpretation of the Malay peoples.
- (iv) Compilation and comparative study of data on "sea-active" groups such as the contemporary Bajao and Bugis of today, which will also go back in time to make possible a conceptualization of the Malay form of sea trade and movements which kept all parts of the Malay region in contact, from Madagascar to the Philippines and portions of Micronesia (long-term).

#### *Priorities*

- (i) Philippine-Indonesian key area programme expected to begin in the near future. Unesco aid needed for detailed planning and for a portion of the second phase field programme on coastal West Irian and off-shore islands, 1974-76.
- (ii) Third phase Philippine-Indonesian key area programme in Moluccas-Halmahera portion, Unesco funds needed for planning and a portion of the field work, 1976-78.

- (iii) To be organized with the programme on Hoabinhian human skeletal remains (Project 3 above).

*Project 7: Study of Mainland South-East Asian Austronesian Languages*

*Objective*

To study the relationship of the Austronesian languages found in Mainland South-East Asia, such as Cham, Radaï and Jarai with the Island South-East Asian and other Austronesian languages. . . .

*Project 8: Reconstruction Beyond Central Malay Area*

*Objective*

Because of the importance to the reconstruction of the primary Malay culture of inferences drawn from its archaic Oceanic and Madagascar extensions, and its ancestral archaeological extension in Thailand, Burma, Indo-China, South-East China and Taiwan, a continuing research cooperation at the level of Governments, Institutions and Scholars is recommended.

Interdisciplinary and International cooperation beyond the limits of the present Malay Cultural Area is therefore generally recommended, together with a specific and continuing liaison with the Oceanic Cultural Study Project. . . .

*Project 9: Further Functions of Regional Centres*

*Objective*

In view of the need to relate the Malay cultural project to "development" in all its aspects in the Malay area, and the further need for a vehicle enabling the local community to benefit at the "grass-roots" local level, it is proposed that high priority be given to the establishment of local Cultural Centres whose functions combine elements of the traditional museum repository, the community public library, the community school services and the newly proposed demonstration centres for the performing and creative arts, as under:

- (i) Architectural provision for the demonstration of the creative and performing arts.
- (ii) Facilities for the conservation and display of local material culture in its ecological and social context.
- (iii) Facilities for the collection and filing of local oral traditions.
- (iv) Study of archaeological remains and their interpretation through display.
- (v) Protection of local archaeological sites and monuments and artifacts existing in an archaeological context.
- (vi) The study and exhibition of local history.
- (vii) The publication of a magazine concerning the above matters.

As models for such centres the Report cites the Indonesian centres at Jogjakarta, Solo, Bali and Taman Ismail Marzuki in Jakarta.

The first meeting of the Council for the Study of Malay Culture was held in Manila in August 1972. Here a biennial budget for 1973/74 was set up and within the Foundations of Malay Culture, projects 6 and 7 were selected to begin in 1973 (MNCU 1972). At the meeting of the General Conference of UNESCO in late 1972 a budgetary crisis developed primarily because of U.S. dollar devaluation, and the budgets for all projects were cut to a major degree. Rather than cut all projects in the Malay Study Program proportionally, so that no projects would have had sufficient funds to do anything, support for some projects was cut out completely so that one or two projects could move ahead. The Foundations of Malay Culture was one of those projects cut out of funding, probably in part as this project was already under way and partially funded.

The first program of Project 6 involves archaeological exploration and testing in southeastern Mindanao (Philippines) and northeastern Indonesia. This is a joint program of the National Museum of the Philippines, the Lembaga Purbakala dan Peninggalan Nasional (National Archaeological Institute of Indonesia), and the Department of Anthropology of the University of Hawaii. The first phase of this project took place in the field in southeastern Mindanao from June to November 1972. The second phase, in the Vogelkop area of Irian Jaya (Indonesian New Guinea), will hopefully be in the field from June 1975 to May 1976. It had been planned that all three sponsors of this program would work together on all phases, but technical problems prevented Indonesian participation in the first phase. We hope to have a preliminary report on the Mindanao phase of this work in one of the next issues of *Asian Perspectives*.

Preliminary work on Project 2 has been undertaken by Bion Griffin of the University of Hawaii, and if field conditions permit, he will start a one-year program in the field in northeastern Luzon, Philippines, in June 1974. Fieldwork on the first program of Project 3 in northwestern Thailand will come to a close in July 1974. This work, under the direction of Chester Gorman, has also been a program from the University of Hawaii, financed by grants from the United States National Science Foundation.

#### FIRST REGIONAL SEMINAR ON SOUTHEAST ASIAN PREHISTORY AND ARCHAEOLOGY

To my knowledge this seminar was the first regional meeting on Southeast Asian prehistory and the first international meeting on prehistoric archaeology to be organized, hosted, and run in Southeast Asia by a local, noncolonial institution. The Philippine National Museum was the host institution, while the Division of Anthropology, headed by Eric Casiño, organized and ran the meeting. Financial assistance came from the Ford Foundation. The only other international meetings where Southeast Asian prehistory was a central subject were the first four meetings of the Far-Eastern Prehistory Association (Solheim 1957); the first three were organized and run by colonial governments, and the fourth was held in conjunction with the Eighth Pacific Science Congress, where H. Otley Beyer was the organizer of the archaeology meetings.

The meeting got under way in difficult circumstances. It was scheduled to begin on the 26th of June, but typhoon Yoling went almost directly over Manila the

morning of the 25th, causing major flooding and much damage to the planes of the commercial airlines. Several of the participants from outside the Philippines were arriving on the 25th but were turned back because of the typhoon. They didn't arrive until the 26th or 27th, and one or two came even later. The group was scheduled to fly to Palawan to visit the Tabon Caves for four days beginning the 27th, but when we reached the airport we found that the flight had been canceled because of lack of aircraft, and the flights to Palawan on the 28th and 29th were full. The schedule was quickly reorganized, but no space became available on the Philippine Air Lines flights to Palawan.

On the 30th of June the Office of the President of the Philippines made available a military aircraft to take us to Palawan and to return to pick us up on the 3rd of July. When we reached Puerto Princesa on the 30th we found that the Governor of Palawan, Salvador Socrates, and many of the leading citizens of Palawan had planned a party for our arrival on the 27th and had not been informed on the 27th that we could not make it. On our return to Puerto Princesa on the 2nd of July we were the guests of this repeated party, and a wonderful memory of Filipino and Palawano hospitality was taken away by all of us.

We arrived at Quezon, the closest point to the Tabon Caves, and the location of the Museum headquarters for the archaeological program in the caves, just at dark. We had to walk the last kilometer through mud that was ankle-deep in places and found that our hosts from the Museum, who had been waiting for us for four days, had given us up. The Filipino, and Southeast Asian, ability to cope in emergencies is remarkable. In spite of our surprise arrival, within an hour we had a hot supper and dry beds available. The next morning the party was taken out for a quick visit to some of the main cave sites (Plate I) where Bob Fox, the Director for the Museum of the archaeological program in Palawan, told us about the program and explained the sites which we were able to visit. In the late afternoon, after our return to the base camp, we had a very informal but rewarding seminar at the laboratory-dormitory (Plate II) on the hill overlooking the camp.

One of the days of the meeting in Manila we broke up into working subcommittees. These were: Substantive Findings, chaired by R. P. Soejono of Indonesia; Methods and Techniques, chaired by Jesus Peralta of the Philippines; and Training and Cooperation, chaired by Al Rashid of Malaysia. Previous to the working sessions Khuon Khun Neay, the chief delegate from the Khmer Republic, presented a paper on prehistoric archaeology in his country. In closing he announced that a regional seminar on archaeology and historical architecture would be held in Phnom Penh toward the end of 1972. Many points that were brought up during the sessions of the subcommittees were not completed but left to be brought up again at the Phnom Penh meeting. This included the founding of a regional archaeological association. As it turned out, the meeting in Phnom Penh had a specific program (see discussion of ARCAFA below) and no time was available there for continuation of the discussions begun in Manila, though many of the points and suggestions made by the subcommittees were incorporated in the ARCAFA recommendations. As a partial result, however, some points were left incomplete and nothing further developed on the new association.

The proceedings of the seminar are being edited by Eric Casiño. Among other publications presented to the delegates at the meeting was a bibliography on





Plate I Tabon Caves, Palawan: *top*, returning to the boats after seeing Mannungal Cave, entrance to which is on the right; *bottom*, Bob Fox explaining Tabon Cave, just inside the entrance to the cave.



Plate II Seminar opening by Eric Casiño in the National Museum laboratory-dormitory at Quezon, Palawan.

Philippine archaeology (Tantoco 1972). Official delegates were as follows: Cambodia—Khoun Khun Neay and Touch Puyeto; Indonesia—R. P. Soejono and Teuku Jacob; Malaysia—Al Rashid; Thailand—Vidya Intakosai and Preecha Kanchanagoma; and the Philippines—Israel Cabanilla, Eric S. Casiño, Avelino Legaspi, Inocentes P. Paniza, and Jesus T. Peralta from the National Museum, Lionel Chiong from Silliman University, Alfredo E. Evangelista and F. Landa Jocano from the University of the Philippines, Marcelino Maceda from San Carlos University, and Jose B. Lugay from the San Miguel Glass Factory. Resource persons were Robert B. Fox, National Museum of the Philippines; Chester F. Gorman, University of Otago, New Zealand, and University of Hawaii; Rhys Jones, Australian National University; and myself. In spite of the typhoon, the seminar was a success in all ways.

#### FIELD TRAINING

Until very recently virtually none of the archaeologists working in Southeast Asia had worked in more than their own country, and those that had were all foreigners. Before World War II van Stein Callenfels was the only archaeologist who had worked in more than one Southeast Asian country. Since then there have been Tom Harrisson, John Matthews, Brian Peacock, Gale Sieveking, and myself. Of these, Matthews and Sieveking are no longer involved in the area. The only Southeast Asian of whom I know who has a personal knowledge of more than one country is Rosa Tanazas of San Carlos University in Cebu City, Philippines. In late 1965 and early 1966 she visited museums and archaeologists in several Southeast Asian countries. The meetings of the last three years have enabled a few of the more senior archaeologists to see a bit of the archaeology of other countries, and the work of the ARCAFA task force (see ARCAFA below) gave Alfredo Evangelista of the Philippines the chance to visit most of the museums and become acquainted with most of the archaeologists of the eight member countries. The best way to become acquainted, however, is to be actively involved in field and laboratory work. This involvement is now starting to happen in a small way.

Early in 1973 the Government of Malaysia began a five-year program of excavation and restoration of early Indian-influenced architectural sites in Kedah. The Ford Foundation is providing funds to support a few non-Malaysian students to work with this continuing project.

The "First ASEAN Summer Field School in Archaeology" was held in San Piro, Balayan, Batangas, Philippines from the 2nd to the 31st of May 1973. "The Field School is a project of the ASEAN Permanent Committee on Socio-Cultural Activities, and was held with the following objectives: a) To establish the prehistoric links of the cultures and peoples of ASEAN countries; b) To advance and disseminate knowledge of Southeast Asian prehistory; c) To establish a region-wide training ground for the development of Asian archaeologists in methodology and cross-national comparisons" (ASEAN 1973: 2). The hosts of the school, on behalf of the Philippines, were the National Museum of the Philippines, the University of the Philippines, and the ASEAN National Secretariat of the Philippines. Eric Casiño, chief anthropologist of the Museum, was the administrator of the field

school, and Evangelista, then of the University and now Assistant Director of the National Museum, was in charge of the instructional program.

The site at San Piro was an open burial site of the 14th and 15th centuries A.D. and was probably not far from a living site. About half of each day was spent in excavation and the other half with lectures and work on the collections. Lecturers and staff from outside the Philippines included Peter White from the University of Sydney in Australia, Oswald Thesiera from the National Museum of Malaysia, and Bion Griffin and myself from the University of Hawaii. Unfortunately, only two students from outside the Philippines (Thailand) were able to take part in the field school. It was, however, a beginning in regional training which, if it continues in future years, will lead to much wider regional background among Southeast Asian archaeologists.

At long last there is a beginning of an official archaeological salvage program as a part of the Lower Mekong Development Program. I have been trying to get such a program going since 1959 (Solheim and Hackenberg 1961; Solheim 1963), so it is a relief to see it finally started even though it took until late 1973 to get under way and starts as only a survey. Unfortunately, instead of a comprehensive program including all areas involved and to be involved in the Mekong Development Project it includes only one project area, the Pa Mong dam and reservoir in northeastern Thailand and west-central Laos. Donn Bayard from the University of Otago in Dunedin, New Zealand is in charge.

To help in regional training of archaeologists the Ford Foundation, which furnished the funds to the Mekong Committee for the two-year survey of the Pa Mong area, has made an agreement with Bayard concerning training of young archaeologists from the four riparian countries (Khmer Republic, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam) in conjunction with the survey program. Two advanced students from each of the four countries were supposed to have joined Bayard's team in late January to work with them until the end of the first season late in March. Unfortunately, only one student from Vietnam was able to join the team early during the first year. One Lao and some Thai students were able to join late in the season. There seems to be a problem in selection or even in finding advanced students, and once they are selected, in breaking them loose from their schedules at home. It is understandable that such difficulties would come up the first time such an attempt is made. We can hope that it will be more successful during the next season's work.

#### ARCAFA

The Applied Research Center in Archaeology and Fine Arts is a prospective project of SEAMEO (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization). To present the background of ARCAFA it is first necessary to briefly explain SEAMEO.

SEAMEO was founded in November 1965 and today has eight member countries: Indonesia, Khmer Republic, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam. For background on SEAMEO, I quote from its charter:

The purpose and function is to promote co-operation among the Southeast Asian nations through education, science and culture in order to further respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are the birth-rights of the peoples of the world.

To realize this purpose the Organization will: a) Collaborate in the work of advancing mutual knowledge and understanding of the peoples in Southeast Asia as well as the rest of the world; b) Promote and collaborate with the Member States, at their request, in joint projects and programs of mutual benefit concerning education, science and culture, and assist the members in the development of educational activities; c) Maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge; and d) Assist in articulating education to the economic and social goals in the individual Member States. (APDO 1973a: 2)

To accomplish these objectives SEAMEO has six active project centers, plus ARCAFA, in the process of development. ARCAFA is the only center concerned with culture or the "understanding of the peoples in Southeast Asia" and is somewhat different from the other six project centers.

The ruling body of SEAMEO is SEAMEC (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Council), which meets once a year in January. SEAMES (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Secretariat) . . . is the executive arm of the Council. It insures that the policies, directives, and guidelines of the Council are translated into action programs by the various Centers. It also participates in coordinating inter-center activities and, most importantly is responsible for raising the Special Funds (primarily scholarships/fellowships) component of SEAMEO. SEAMES is a full-time organization with a regional staff drawn from the member countries" (APDO 1973a: 5).

At the 6th SEAMEC Conference in 1971, the year they joined SEAMEO, the Khmer Republic proposed ARCAFA and the Conference agreed to the idea in principle. A draft of the proposal was prepared by the Khmer Republic and this was the subject of a feasibility study undertaken by SEAMES. A revised draft was submitted to the 7th Annual SEAMEC Conference in 1972, which then recommended that a preparatory conference be held in Phnom Penh in 1972.

The Preparatory Conference on the Restoration and Animation of Historical Sites was held from 4 to 8 December. Invitations had been sent to the ministers of education of the SEAMEO member countries on 12 October. They were asked to designate a delegation of three specialists, these to be 1. an archaeologist; 2. a historical monument architect or specialist; and 3. a site-arrangement specialist. Each country was asked to send to Phnom Penh a "Country Report" (ARCAFA 1973: II, 22-23). This report was to include the following information:

1) *At the latest by November 15, 1972*: List of archaeological institutions and schools in your country, list of archaeologists engaged in archaeological studies of your country, list of museums, curators, museum staff and experts related to archaeological studies in your country, list of excavation projects in your country, list of specialists engaged in such methodological studies of archaeology as excavation, preservation, restoration and classification, list of linguists capable of reading old manuscripts and inscriptions.

2) *At a later date*: List of paleographical sources, manuscripts and inscriptions, list of archaeological publications including journals and monographs." (ARCAFA 1973: II, 489).

The first two days of the conference, following opening speeches and election of officials, was primarily spent in the presentation of the Country Reports. The elected officials were: Chairman—Chhun Hean Ho Tong Ho, head of the Khmer delegation; Vice-Chairman—S. Suleiman, head of the Indonesian delegation; Vice-Chairman—Nguyen Ba Lang, head of the Vietnamese delegation; and Rapporteur-Général—Eric S. Casiño, head of the Philippine delegation. The delegates listed as archaeologists or approximate equivalents are: Suleiman, Soediman, and A. S. Wibowo from Indonesia; Prachit Soulisak and Kenchanh Sirivath from Laos; Alfredo E. Evangelista from the Philippines; Chin You-di from Thailand; and Nguyen Ba Lang and Ngiem Tham from Vietnam. Among the eighteen consultants were: Elizabeth Lyons, Ford Foundation; myself; F. R. Allchin, University of Cambridge; Helmut H. E. Loofs, Australian National University; Bernard P. Groslier, École Française d'Extrême-Orient; and Touch Puyeto, Université des Beaux Arts, Khmer Republic (ARCAFA 1973: I, 79–83).

Late on the second day and all of the third day we broke into three subcommittees. These were respectively concerned with 1. Sites and Historical Monuments and Arrangement of Archaeological Sites; 2. Museums and Documentation, and 3. Training and Teaching. The fourth day the reports of the subcommittees were presented to a plenary session, and the fifth day we approved the final report, adopted resolutions and recommendations, and held the closing ceremonies.

A two-volume final report was the production of the Conference (ARCAFA 1973: I, II). In the first volume are presented the Final Resolutions, General Considerations, Recommendations of Subcommittees, Summary of Country Reports, List of Elected Members and Participants, List of Subcommittee Members, and Appendices. The second volume includes the details of the meeting, all of the Country Reports in full, and Appendices. The Country Reports present in one volume more than has ever before been presented on the status of archaeology and museums in Southeast Asia. As a summary of the conference I quote the "General Considerations" from Volume I (pp. 25–28).

The preparatory Conference on the Restoration and Animation of Historical Sites for the purpose of establishing an Applied Research Center for Archaeology and Fine Arts—ARCAFA, which convenes in Phnom-Penh December 4–8, 1972,

- after having heard the reports presented by the delegates from SEAMEO member countries and having studied them with the assistance of international experts invited for that purpose,
- notes that all efforts must be made in all member countries and with the utmost urgency to conserve the cultural heritage which is being seriously threatened by time and by man where it constitutes one of the most significant and important art complexes in the world,
- recognizes moreover the existence of a cultural unity among the countries of SEAMEO and the fact that the problems to be solved are very often similar and that they will be more easily resolved by close collaboration,
- considers that in this prospect common action should be undertaken in order to profit as much as possible from the resources in specialists and material

means which are now limited, in contrast to the immense task with which we are confronted,

—concludes therefore that one of the best means of action we can envisage is the establishment of ARCAFA to play the role of a center for information, training and coordination and in the future, of concerned common action.

As a result, the delegations assembled in Phnom-Penh submit to the SEAMEO council the following considerations:

1. That in conformity with the decision in principle reached at the 7th SEAMEC Conference in Vientiane in 1972, ARCAFA should be established in Phnom-Penh with the responsibility of meeting the above mentioned needs and to implement the policy stated above;
2. That each SEAMEO member minister should draw his Government's attention to the importance of the problems to be solved, the urgency of concerted action especially through ARCAFA and finally to the means towards this objective;
3. That SEAMEC should through its competent representatives make similar approaches to international institutions and interested countries for the purpose of obtaining their collaboration and assistance;
4. That the organization and the financing of ARCAFA and the establishment of the project development office should be decided upon at the 8th SEAMEC Conference planned to be held in January 1973;
5. That, the project development office should prepare a first program of urgent action common to all member countries. This work could be undertaken in temporary premises put at the disposal of ARCAFA by the Khmer Republic.
6. Within the terms of this general program and in order to achieve the objectives mentioned above, the preparatory Conference would like particularly to draw the attention of the Governments of SEAMEO to the following points:

1. *Concerning the protection of the cultural heritage*

- a. That all the Governments should develop or improve, their national legislation for the protection of the national heritage, taking into account most particularly prehistoric sites without visible monuments, which are very often ignored and the more recent historical sites which too are very often neglected.
- b. that to this end a survey and an inventory of the cultural properties should be promoted as actively as possible.
- c. that all the governments by common consent and on the basis of their national legislation and inventories, take severe measures to stop looting and illegal traffic in cultural properties which pose more danger than time and natural forces.

*2. Concerning the conservation of the cultural heritage*

- a. That urgent care should be provided for monuments already known, which now more than ever are threatened by age as well as recent events and that consequently no program should be undertaken before the secure safeguarding of those existing great complexes.
- b. That to this end and in agreement with point 1-a, the inventory (and survey) of the national heritage from the standpoint of priority and degree of urgency should be accelerated together with scientific and technical studies necessary for their conservation.
- c. That in order to achieve these objectives, absolute priority should be given to the training of scientific and technical personnel for the conservation of historical monuments and cultural properties.

*3. Concerning scientific perspectives*

- a. That in agreement with points 1a, 2a and b, research should be focused upon the great historical monuments.
  - b. That prehistoric research, which in the past two decades has seen a remarkable development and brought an immense harvest of new facts, should be actively furthered and coordinated. It is often the case that these sites are not easily located and are most exposed to damage (Ref. point 1-a).
  - c. That international collaboration should be developed in the spirit of the universal character of science, but also every effort should be made to develop a regional approach and specific methods for the solution of problems peculiar to the region.
  - d. To this effect, it is desirable to have higher education of the best quality as well as research centers, and most specially museums, but that a strong current of exchange and collaboration should be encouraged among SEAMEO countries.
4. a. Concerning the social and economic development, it is essential that the proper utilization of the cultural heritage should contribute to the general development of each nation. And in this aim, it must be integrated into the overall planning of growth.
- b. However, it is imperative that this development be carefully implemented and should not endanger the archaeological monuments and sites. But if destruction is unavoidable, exhaustive scientific study should be undertaken beforehand (see 1a, b, c, 2a, b, c, 3b).
  - c. Furthermore, it is essential that the cultural heritage should contribute to the progress of nations. However, it must not become an object of trade or mere show but, on the contrary, it should contribute to education in each country so as to enhance an awareness of national identity as well as the recognition of many common cultural elements of the region.



Based on the results of the Conference and established procedures of SEAMEO, "Guidelines for the Establishment of the ARCAFA Project Development Office" were submitted to SEAMEC at its January 1973 meeting, and these were approved. This Office, known as APDO, is to work out the plan for ARCAFA, which is to be presented to SEAMEC in early 1975.

The immediate program of APDO was to analyze the Country Reports and arrange for the Task Force recommended by Sub-committee III of the Preparatory Conference on Training and Teaching. The report of the Sub-Sub-committee on Archaeology was as follows:

The sub-Committee considered carefully the possible training functions which ARCAFA might perform for the region and it concluded that among the first tasks of ARCAFA must be to gather more detailed information on manpower needs and available training resources. Therefore, as a first step, it is proposed that a task force be created to carry out this preliminary work. This task force should have four members with the following qualifications and background.

## II. *Task Force*

1. A specialist in manpower study with some background in education.
2. A specialist in the restoration of monuments with some background in historical archaeology.
3. A specialist in archaeology with a background in prehistoric archaeology.
4. A specialist in the restoration of sculptural properties i.e. other than historical monuments.

The sub-committee has suggested the following terms of reference to be followed by the task force in carrying out its mission. It suggests that the task force start its work as soon as possible.

## III. *Terms of Reference*

1. Survey and assess the needs of the member countries in the field of archaeology and conservation.
  - a. Determine the types of specialists and trained personnel in the study, restoration and conservation of such materials as stone, brick, metal, wood, fabrics, pottery, etc. . . .
  - b. Determine the levels of technical training necessary.
  - c. Devise appropriate tactics and priorities for the training of instructors and trainees.
  - d. Obtain necessary data and information related to the above needs through direct, on-the-spot contacts with key institutions in each member country.
2. Survey and assess existing facilities in each country for the training and further training of archaeologists and curators of museums, monuments, and historic sites.
3. Survey the employment opportunities and conditions for personnel in the fields mentioned above.

4. Identify the gaps between the needs and available resources and recommend specific actions at the regional level to supplement existing facilities and resources, for instance:
  - Utilize existing projects as part of regional training programs.
  - Maximize available resources through exchange of trainees and instructors in a most effective and *economical way*.

#### IV. Conclusion

After the detailed information and recommendations of the Task Force are available, appropriate steps can be taken to develop more detailed training proposals. (ARCAFA 1973: I, 43-44).

The Task Force was made up of Khuon Khun Neay of the Khmer Republic, the Task Force leader; Pierre Pichard, restoration of monuments specialist from France; from 15 to 31 August, Pisit Charoenwongsa of Thailand, and from 1 September to 26 October, Alfredo Evangelista of the Philippines, as archaeologists; and Arphorn Na Songkhla, restoration of art-objects specialist from Thailand. They submitted their report to APDO and the report for each country to the respective countries for them to review at national seminars.

National seminars were held by Indonesia, the Khmer Republic, Malaysia, Philippines, and Thailand. In most cases these meetings were the first ever held in the country to examine archaeology and museum programs within the country, and in themselves must have served a very worthwhile, stocktaking purpose. A report from each of these meetings was sent to APDO. With data from the Country Reports submitted for the 1972 Conference, from the Task Force report, and the new reports from the country seminars, APDO was ready to start serious work on the plan for ARCAFA. The first action taken was the ARCAFA Regional Seminar to examine the data and make specific recommendations and suggestions to APDO as a basis for the plan.

The ARCAFA Regional Seminar was held in Phnom Penh from 29 to 31 December 1973. The delegates who are archaeologists or museum specialists were Setyawati Suleiman of Indonesia; Khuon Khun Neay and Dam Chhoeun of the Khmer Republic; Prashit Soulisak and Kenechanh Thirakul of Laos; Kamarul Baherin Buyong of Malaysia; Avelino M. Legaspi of the Philippines; Christopher Hooi of Singapore; Chira Chongkol and Pisit Charoenwongsa of Thailand; and Nguyen Ba Lang and Nghiem Tham of Vietnam. Archaeological Associate Members were B. P. Groslier and Jeannine Auboyer of France; Consultants were myself and Elizabeth Lyons from the United States, and Grace Morley of ICOM. The Seminar Officers were Khuon Khun Neay—Chairman; Chira Chongkol—Vice-Chairman; Prashit Soulisak—Vice-Chairman; and Leonardo M. Concepcion of the Philippines—Rapporteur-Général.

We worked hard for three days. I quote the Summary of the Final Report (APDO 1974: 3-5) for the results of the Seminar, followed by the specific recommendations (APDO 1974: 11-17).

This report describes the results of the Regional Seminar on Archaeology and Fine Arts held by the ARCAFA Project Development Office in Phnom-Penh December 28-31, 1973.

The objectives of this seminar were to identify archaeological/fine arts problems and needs common to the SEAMEO region upon which ARCAFA could develop a program of regional assistance; to assign priorities to these needs; and finally, to recommend how they might be most effectively solved on a regional basis, taking into account the limited resources existing in each member country.

This seminar brought together archaeological and fine arts experts from all SEAMEO member countries as well as a number of internationally known experts. The seminar thus provided a forum for the SEAMEO delegates to discuss their unique country needs/problems; determine if they were common to other countries in the region; and learn of new approaches to their solution.

Most importantly, these professional discussions did identify a number of common SEAMEO critical needs and problems and their priorities in the field of training, research and clearing house activities. These needs and problems, which currently impede progress in the overall archaeological development of the SEAMEO Region, are discussed in this report. They thus provide the basic inputs for ARCAFA's Long Range Development Plan. The experts at the Seminar also recommended possible approaches that ARCAFA might use most effectively for meeting these needs while simultaneously insuring the most effective coordination of regional efforts and the use of the region's limited archaeological resources.

The ARCAFA Regional Seminar was in effect the culmination of the first year of the ARCAFA Project Development Office's Operation as outlined in the "Guidelines for Establishment of the ARCAFA Project Development Office" (MC8/IC/7—Appendix IV) (1) as approved by the SEAMEC at its Eighth Conference in Phnom-Penh in January, 1973.

The major activities completed included: Analysis of country reports and other data presented at the December 1972 Preparatory Conference and preparation of a report on this analysis. Initiation of action on specific detailed recommendations made at the Preparatory Conference (in particular, collection of clearing house information). Questionnaires plus on-site survey in each member country to determine the manpower and facilities resources available now and needed in the future in the field of archaeology in the region. Analysis of the country resources survey results and completed questionnaires and the preparation of a detailed report describing regional resource problems and available support. Planning for and support of National Seminar in each member country to further identify national archaeological/fine arts needs. Reports are available on the Seminars of the Khmer Republic, Indonesia, Thailand, Malaysia and the Philippines. Planning and conduct of the Regional Seminar as reported in this Document.

The above effort has provided APDO with sufficient technical information to begin preparation of its long range Development Plan. This Plan will become ARCAFA's guidelines for the professional programs determined most important to the region and most practical in terms of effective use of the region's existing and projected archaeological capabilities.

These programs, described in detail subsequently, are: Training of various

---

(1) Ref. report listed in WP/RS/4.

categories of archaeological specialists who in turn can train their own national experts, thus obtaining the maximum multiplier effect. Research in areas identified as of major importance to the region; this research would include on-site studies where existing work is in progress, plus supporting laboratory research, using existing national resources initially and eventually supplementing those research facilities by a central laboratory at ARCAFA. Clearing House activities were considered fundamental to all and ARCAFA was encouraged to continue to expand them; Conference Seminars/Workshops on specific regional problems were considered vital to continue the interchange of professional information begun during the past year and exemplified by the Regional Seminar in particular.

The conference agreed that there were many archaeological problem areas common to the SEAMEO Region where ARCAFA could have a major impact in effecting solutions. It further stressed the effective coordination and use of existing regional facilities and primary attention being given to regional programs which provided the maximum multiplier effect for subsequent national programs.

The key recommendations of the seminar are presented in the next section.

#### No. I

##### THE REGIONAL SEMINAR

Considering the manpower and other resources, the data available and the needs encountered in each SEAMEO member country

##### RECOMMENDS TO APDO

1. That ARCAFA should be charged with functions in the following four areas.
  - A. Training of specialists in the various fields of prehistoric and historical archaeology, restoration and preservation of cultural properties, museology, fine arts and folk arts.
  - B. Research in the areas relevant to the needs of the region regarding archaeology, and the arts.
  - C. Documentation and clearing house activities.
  - D. Organization of seminars, conferences and workshops to enable specialists in the various fields to communicate and discuss problems and proposed solutions.
2. That the four functions should serve as the basis for planning the organizational structure of ARCAFA.

#### No. II

1. That two categories of training be considered as first priority namely:
  - A. High level specialists preferably trainers such as curators, conservation scientists, documentalists and librarians.
  - B. Non-university level technicians.
2. That ARCAFA should promote and sponsor a regular exchange of qualified personnel among SEAMEO member countries.

## No. III

1. That ARCAFA should set up as a first step, a research laboratory for conservation and restoration at its home base, taking into account the existing resources of the member countries.
2. That ARCAFA research laboratory cooperate with laboratories in their programs of research relevant to regional needs.

## No. IV

1. That ARCAFA expedite efforts in the compilation, classification, collation, collection of documents and data from member countries.
2. That ARCAFA establish standard documentation, terminology and methodology concerning cultural property suitable for use by SEAMEO member countries.
3. That ARCAFA act as the clearing house for the dissemination, translation into different languages, issuance of bulletins and appropriate publications pertaining to the region.

## No. V

1. That ARCAFA organize conferences, seminars and workshops to discuss problems and proposed solutions pertinent to the region whenever such exchanges of views and information are deemed necessary.
2. That ARCAFA promote an exchange of artistic and cultural exhibitions among SEAMEO member countries.

## No. VI

## THE REGIONAL SEMINAR

Recognizing the need and the urgency to protect the cultural heritage of member countries from destruction, by man and nature and other dangers such as those arising from illicit traffic of cultural properties

## RECOMMENDS TO SEAMEO MEMBER COUNTRIES

That they take appropriate action with regard to the adherence to or ratification of the Hague Convention of 1954 and the Paris Conventions of 1970, 1972 [concerning preservation of cultural properties in case of war; concerning import or export of illicit cultural properties; concerning protection of cultural and natural heritage].

## No. VII

## THE REGIONAL SEMINAR

*Recognizing* that there is a growing consciousness that cultural activities are of great importance for humanity;

*Considering* recommendation n° 10 of the Intergovernmental Conference on Cultural Policies in Asia, held in Yogyakarta on December 10–20th, 1973, which recommends that UNESCO support the efforts of ARCAFA;

*Recalling* that both UNESCO and SEAMEO have as one of their goals this development of regional cooperation in the fields of education, science and culture;

*Convinced* that close cooperation and mutual assistance between UNESCO and SEAMEO is to the benefit of the region;

RECOMMENDS TO SEAMES

That SEAMES take appropriate action on the recommendation of the UNESCO Conference.

The Final Report of the ARCAFA Regional Seminar put out by APDO (1974) contains data on the input, conduct, and output of the Seminar and is a valuable document. Earlier APDO (1973*b*) had put out another useful report on the laws and regulations of the member countries having to do with cultural properties. In the three years since its conception and before its birth, ARCAFA has already accomplished much.

One of the problems brought out in the Regional Seminar was the difficulty of attracting bright young people to archaeological and museum careers. Partly this is because of the low status in Southeast Asia of both of these professions. If the programs supporting regional archaeology of both ARCAFA and ASEAN can be coordinated and the work of archaeologists and their results presented to the general public in a regular and orderly fashion, it should not be long before the position of these professions, relative to others, starts to improve.

#### REFERENCES

##### APDO

- 1973*a* *ARCAFA Project Center*. Phnom Penh: APDO.
- 1973*b* *Legislation on Cultural Properties of the SEAMEO Member Countries*. Phnom Penh: APDO.
- 1974 *Final Report ARCAFA Regional Seminar*. Phnom Penh: APDO.

##### ARCAFA

- 1973 *Preparatory Conference on the Restoration and Animation of Historical Sites*. Vols. I and II. Phnom Penh: Government of the Khmer Republic and SEAMES.

##### ASEAN

- 1973 *Report of the First ASEAN Summer Field School in Archaeology*. Manila: National Museum of the Philippines (?).

##### MNCU

- 1972 *Meeting of the Council for the Study of Malay Culture Summary Report Manila, Philippines, 9-11 August, 1972*. Malaysian National Commission for UNESCO.

##### SOLHEIM II, WILHELM G.

- 1957 The Far-Eastern Prehistory Association. *AP* I: 6-12.
- 1963 Salvage archaeology in Thailand. *Bull. Int. Comm. Urg. Anth. Ethn. Res.* 6: 39.

##### SOLHEIM II, WILHELM G., and ROBERT A. HACKENBERG

- 1961 The importance of anthropological research to the Mekong Valley Project. *France-Asie/Asia* 169: 2459-2474.

##### TANTOCO, JR., DANIEL W.

- 1972 *A Selected Bibliography for the Study of Philippine Prehistory*. Manila: National Museum (mimeographed).

##### UNESCO

- 1972 *International Meeting of Experts for the Launching of the Malay Culture Project Final Report*. Paris: UNESCO SHC-72/CONF. 15/5.